

FOUNDATION FOR
The Arts of Peace

TRANSCRIPT

for

IN OUR DEFENSE

Copyright 1983 Foundation for the Arts of Peace

NARRATOR: [voice over video of men walking down Pentagon corridor] The largest peacetime military budget in United States history is now before Congress. More than 1.6 trillion dollars over the next five years. If approved it will cost every family in America 20,000 dollars. That means that the average family will work one year out of the next five years for the Pentagon.

MAN ON STREET: I think that the country is embarked upon a program of military rearmament which is excessive, wasteful, and not really in the best interests of the country.

WOMAN ON STREET: And I wonder why this has taken us 38 years to wake up to this terrible, terrible thing that can be worse than any holocaust, that will leave the whole world devastated.

MAN ON STREET: But we still can't take this good country of ours and do whatever they want with it. We should eliminate them instead of them tryin' to eliminate us.

THOMAS J. WATSON, JR.: [Former Ambassador to the Soviet Union] The people of the United States right now are beginning to learn what I learned in 1977 when I began to work in thermonuclear weapons with the General Advisory Committee. And what I learned was that the situation is totally out of control, that we're relying on totally useless weapons, avoiding making the tough decisions to demonstrate the national will of the United States, and playing politics with things that could ultimately kill us.

NARRATOR. For the next half hour we will look at the facts about the threat of nuclear war on the defense of the United States. We all want security, for ourselves, for our families, and our nation. Yet, more and more Americans are wondering whether we will ever be secure in the nuclear age.

ALEXANDER HAIG: [former Secretary of State; appearing before Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Dec. 5, 1981] For example, there are contingency plans in the NATO doctrine

1918 Bonita Ave., Third Floor Berkeley, California 94704 (415) 486-0264

BOARD OF DIRECTORS: Harriet Barlow, Blue Mountain Center • Tyrone Cashman, College of St. Benedict • Gili Friend, Foundation for the Arts of Peace • Randy Kehler, Traprock Peace Center • John Seizner, Mo Tzu Project ADVISORY COUNCIL: Gordon Adams, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities • Thomas Ambrogio, Archdiocese of San Francisco • Nancy Belden, Washington, D.C. • Mary Benjamin, The Caldwell Project • Betty Bumpers, Peace Links • Jeff Cox, Rodale Press • Bernard Feld, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists • Gordon Feller, Liberty Media • David B. Fleeman, Florida Commission on Ethics • Herb Gunther, Public Media Center • Gail Harper, Performing Artists for Nuclear Disarmament • Michael Harpster, New Line Cinema • Richard Healy, Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy • Hazel Henderson, Center for Alternative Futures • David Hoffman, Evolutionary Blues • Michael J. Kleeman, Finley Films • Carolyn Krebs, New York, NY • Eleanor LeCain, Women's Party for Survival • William Lincoln, National Peace Academy Campaign • John Marks, Search for Common Ground • David McPadden, Mid-Peninsula Conversion Project • Ann Medlock, The Graffiti Project • Tim O'Shea, Bank of America • Nancy Ramsey, Committee for National Security • Diane and Joel Schatz, Transition Graphics • Richard Smoke, Center for Foreign Policy Development, Brown University • Kim Spencer, World Week Studios • Jane Wales, Physicians for Social Responsibility • Marc Weiss, Media Network • Barbara Zheutlin, Film Fund • Anne B. Zill, Fund for Constitutional Government Affiliations for identification only.

FOUNDATION FOR
The Arts of Peace

to fire a nuclear weapon for demonstrative purposes, to demonstrate to the other side that they are exceeding the limits of toleration in the conventional areas.

BILL PLANTE: [CBS News, at White House press conference, Nov. 10, 1981] Mr. President, in your exchange with the editors, you said, "I could see," you said, "where you could have the exchange of tactical weapons against troops in the field, without it bringing either one of the major powers to pushing the button."

PRESIDENT REAGAN: Uh, well I endorse only that I said it was offered as a possibility, and I think you'd have to still say that that possibility could take place. Uh, you can do it and have a pessimistic out view ...on it, or an optimistic, and I always tend to be optimistic.

LOUDSPEAKER: [over video of missile launch procedure in NORAD underground command bunker] Skybird. This is a properly authenticated execution message from the National Command Authority. Execute the emergency war order.

NARRATOR: President Reagan is not the first president to consider the use of nuclear weapons. The course toward nuclear war has had a long and steady history. After Nagasaki, President Truman threatened to use nuclear weapons twice, Eisenhower three times, Kennedy twice, and Nixon once. The Carter administration asserted that in nuclear warfare civilian casualties could be kept within acceptable limits. And the Reagan administration has announced that it intends to build the capacity to fight nuclear wars that range from a limited strike through an extended conflict, to an all-out exchange.

LAUNCH OFFICER: [over video of hand on a launch key] Hands on keys. Key turn on my mark. Three...two...one...mark.

NARRATOR: [over video of a series of missile launches] The Reagan Administration has called for the largest peacetime re-armament in the United States' history. It is twenty billion dollars higher than the peak of the Vietnam War years. It took Congress over forty years to appropriate two trillion dollars for defense, and the Pentagon plans to spend almost that much in the next five years.

CONGRESSMAN JIM WRIGHT: [D-Texas, House Majority Leader] The world cannot afford it. The world teeters on the brink of an economic crisis. There is a world wide depression, not confined only to this country. And

it makes no sense at all for the people of the Soviet Union and the people of the United States together to be spending a half a trillion dollars upon the implements of destruction, when people in both of our countries go hungry. That's insanity!

NARRATOR: [over video of idle factories, demonstrating workers, auto assembly line] Business failures in America have reached their highest level since the Great Depression. Despite election year fluctuations, unemployment in 1983 hit its highest rate in 40 years. The U.S. economy is losing more than 400 billion dollars in output every year.

REP. CARROLL HUBBARD: [D-Kentucky] Our federal budget deficit is all but totally out of control. Right or wrong, the words "here come the Russians," nowadays don't scare Kentuckians half as much as the words, "here come the creditors."

WILLIAM WINPISINGER: [President, International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers] All of the billions and billions and billions of dollars that we invest in ever more sophisticated weaponry have successively bought us, with each new round more and more insecurity. It is absolutely vital that we wind down this horrendous arms race if we are ever going to establish security.

LAUNCH OFFICER: [over video of hand on launch key] Three...two...one...mark.

ROGER MOLLANDER: [Executive Director, Ground Zero, former senior staff, National Security Council] One time I was at a meeting in the Pentagon, where the subject was protracted nuclear war. Would a nuclear war take place like a nine-inning baseball game: they're up, we're up, they're up, we're up? And in the course of the discussion about that, one of the participants, a navy captain, was making observations on the European and U.S. interest, on the part of the public, in the nuclear war issue. And he said, "I don't know what all this excitement is all about. You'd think that it would be the end of the world if nuclear war took place, when in fact only 500 million people would be killed."

SENATOR LARRY PRESSLER: [R-South Dakota] But Mr. Jones, first question that I have is, in a January interview with the L.A. Times, you said that the U.S. could recover fully from an all-out nuclear war with the Soviet Union in just two to four years, if it had a Soviet style civil defence. You reportedly said, "Everyone is going to make

The Arts of Peace

it if there are enough shovels to go around."

THOMAS "T.K." JONES: [Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, in a Senate hearing March 31, 1982] Everybody never survives any war. Some people don't survive it. But the point is that sheltering people does improve the odds.

FEMA WORKER: [on telephone] This is the FEMA Alternate National Warning Center, test, Civil Defense Network test.

DR. WILLIAM FEHLBERG: [Computer manager for Federal Emergency Management Agency] Through this computer terminal, we have connected to the main computer, and have simulated an attack on the United States. This shows that for the city of San Francisco, of the three and a half million people there before the attack, it would show the two and a half million fatalities that occur.

NARRATOR: Despite these predictions, some people shaping America's foreign policy have their own ideas about nuclear war.

LT. GEN. DANIEL GRAHAM: [U.S. Army, ret., Former Director, Defense Intelligence Agency] If it was going to go off right over the top of this building, and I could tell you that an hour from now that's going to happen, and you had enough wits to walk for 59 minutes, and then get behind a lilac bush, you wouldn't be hurt by that bomb.

DR. JENNIFER LEANING, M.D.: [Physicians for Social Responsibility] Why is the government currently finding it necessary to talk about the concept of survival? And I would submit that the need for the government to have this concept, and to promote it in our minds, is more pressing now than ever before, because we are moving from a strategic concept of deterrence--MAD, mutual assured destruction--to a concept of a nuclear war fighting strategy based on the notion that we must use our weapons if we are not to use them.

NARRATOR: [over video of mannequins being placed in an area which is then exploded] The Office of Technology Assessment estimates that in the first 30 days after a nuclear attack, 80 million people would die. By the end of the first years, 137 million would die, and by the end of two years, three quarters of our people would be dead.

MAN ON STREET: What kind of warning would we have? I say everybody'd be dead. We might have a few militarists left alive, and what sort of society would they start?

Look what they're trying to do to this one.

MAN ON STREET: I think they think maybe they're going to be able to escape in some kind of a bomber, and ride it out up there, while the rest of us pull a cellar door over a hole in the ground, and, you know, send the old folks out to test the radioactivity.

SAC COMMANDER: [talking on radio] Launch the force under positive control, I'm going airborne.

NARRATOR: In case of a nuclear attack, generals in the strategic air command, as well as the President, would go airborne in specially hardened aircraft. Other government officials would retreat to underground command bunkers, where they could monitor the devastation above. There, in specially equipped facilities, life would continue normally, secure from the outside world.

MAN ON STREET: And they're talking about evacuating us all? Where the hell would we go? Has anybody ever tried to get out of New York on a Friday afternoon like today, and get up on the highways out of town? I mean there's no way in hell anybody would move out of here.

NARRATOR: The government plan for Washington D.C. calls for cars with odd numbered license plates to wait for those with even numbered plates before leaving the city. The Federal Emergency Management Agency estimates that its evacuation plans would reduce U.S. fatalities to only 20 percent of the population--or 42 million dead.

Opium stocks have been put away to ease peoples' pain after the attack. The postal service will issue postage free emergency change of address cards. The Federal Reserve System is stockpiling currency underground. One of its pamphlets states that "Victory in a nuclear war will belong to the country that recovers first."

THOMAS "T.K." JONES: Our assessment shows that in a full scale nuclear attack on U.S. industry, we in our area could resume some production operations with four to twelve weeks.

LT. GEN. DANIEL GRAHAM: No radiation will kill you at that range--the immediate radiation. You could get killed by fallout later on--but immediate radiation won't kill you, the blast won't kill you, and the heat won't kill you, if you just get in the shade.

DR. JENNIFER LEANING: [video of nuclear blast] Civil defense has become an explicit

The Arts of Peace

part of our nuclear war fighting strategy, but civil defense cannot change what the weapons can do.

DR. JUDITH LIPTON, M.D.: [Physicians for Social Responsibility] There was a class of seven-year-old children, about 15 kids. And the teacher asked them, "What do you think? Is there going to be a nuclear war?" Fourteen kids raised their hands. One of them didn't. And the teacher said, "Why didn't, you know, why do you think there won't be a nuclear war?" The little boy said, "It's 'cause my Daddy goes to meetings all the time to prevent it."

NARRATOR: [over video of missiles, bombers, and submarines] Last year a secret Pentagon document was made available to the American people. Its contents reveal a chilling departure from the past. For almost 40 years, the United States developed nuclear weapons only to prevent a nuclear exchange. Now they will be built to fight a nuclear war.

Signed by Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger in March of 1982, the document states that the United States "must prevail in controlled nuclear counterattacks over a protracted period." Plans will be made for "decapitating...the Soviet military and political power structure." Preparations will be made to "wage war effectively in outer space," and "treaties will not be signed" which prevent us from doing so. The United States will protect its security interests "if need be without arms control."

GEN. MAXWELL TAYLOR: [U.S. Army, ret., former Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff] We talk about it as if we thought we could run a government, keep a country going, while we were lobbing back and forth a few bombs just to test out the other side. That is utter nonsense. Dangerous nonsense.

GEN. BENJAMIN ROGERS: [Supreme Allied Commander, NATO] I happen to be one who believes that the first use of nuclear weapons by either side, will escalate very quickly to the strategic nuclear exchange. I personally am convinced that they are no more anxious to do that than we are.

DAVID AARON: [former Deputy Director, National Security Council, over video of Hiroshima, 1945] Somehow mankind for the next fifty years, hundred years, a thousand years, is going to have these weapons around and never use them? Is that really conceivable? And if it's not conceivable--and I don't think it is--then every effort has to be bent toward controlling them, and controlling the reasons why they might be used.

NARRATOR: [over video of Women's Strike for Peace, 1961] Twenty years ago, as a result of world-wide protest, we and the Russians signed the Limited Test Ban Treaty. This was followed by the ABM treaty, and the SALT I accords. But in 1979, progress towards any further arms control was halted. The Senate failed to ratify the SALT II treaty, despite the testimony of our highest military officers.

GEN. DAVID C. JONES: [U.S. Army, ret., former Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff] The treaty restricts the Soviets more than it restricts the United States. The big issue is, could it have restricted the Soviets further. We would have liked to have done so. We would have liked to have reduced the Soviets further. But when you look at this treaty, it restricts them more than it does us.

TOWNSEND HOOPES: [former Assistant Secretary of the Air Force] The opponents of SALT and the opponents of nuclear restraint refuse to accept the fact that there is now a permanent nuclear equality between the superpowers, and that that is not going to be changed.

CONGRESSMAN JIM LEACH: [R-Iowa] Mr. Chairman, the most mischievous notion in modern politics is that the United States somehow faces some sort of window of vulnerability with the Soviet Union, and that our second strike capacity is grossly inadequate. As Dickens would have said, "This is humbug!" When you have the capacity to destroy the Soviet Union many times over, there is no such notion as inferiority.

GEN. JOHN VESSEY: [Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff] I would like to take some of the things that the Soviets have for their forces, in terms of numbers, and give them to our forces. But over all, would I trade with Marshal Agorkov? Not on your life.

RADIO COMMUNICATOR: [voice over video of SAC crews scrambling to their bombers] Message follows: Tango, six, three...

NARRATOR: America's top military leaders agree that our strategic forces are stronger than those of the Soviet Union. They believe that arms control is in our best interests. We continue to ignore them, and have paid a heavy price.

A ban on the hydrogen bomb in 1950 would have frozen the Russians at two atomic bombs. A comprehensive test ban in 1963 would have frozen them at 200. A ban on multiple warheads in 1975 would have frozen them at 2,500. Now the Russians have over

The Arts of Peace

8,000 strategic warheads, and the United States over 9,500.

HERBERT SCOVILLE: [Former Deputy Director, Central Intelligence Agency; President, Arms Control Association] Those who say more weapons improve security are still living in the pre-World War II age. That's what was true before World War II, but they haven't learned what nuclear weapons are all about.

THOMAS J. WATSON, JR.: [voice over video of explosion, file footage of summit meetings] Our imperative--to change our course, to take the only road which offers a viable hope for the future. Not a road to unilateral action of any kind, but a road to a long series of mutually verifiable treaties.

GEN. DAVID C. JONES: [appearing before Senate committee] What is important, to me, for everyone to understand, is we need to know what the Soviets are doing, just as much without a treaty as with a treaty. And the treaty, through non-concealment, non-interference, and so forth--

A SENATOR: ...counting rules.

GEN. JONES: The counting rules helps in the verification process.

A SENATOR: But now, on the basis of this treaty, you are testifying that in your judgment it is adequately verifiable.

GEN. JONES: Yes, sir.

WILLIAM KINCADE: [Director, Arms Control Association] ...and we don't have to trust the Russians. All we have to do is trust the fact that they know where their self interest lies, and that they know how to pursue that self interest.

HERBERT YORK: [former Asst. Secretary of Defense, Research & Engineering] Arms control is not something you negotiate with your friends. It's something you negotiate with your antagonists, or enemies, or whatever words you want to use.

THOMAS J. WATSON, JR.: [voice over launch of ICBM from submarine] If we keep going down the more weapons road, there is a point of no return. There is a point at which the world gets so unstable that a retreat from the brink will be impossible. And then it's just a matter of waiting for the accident to happen. We're not there at this point, but it's certainly a place that we could get to in the future.

NARRATOR: The nuclear arms race is now 40 years old. Both sides have more weapons, but neither side is more secure. The swelling arsenals are a sign not of technological triumph, but of political failure, the failure to bring these weapons under control.

REP. SIDNEY R. YATES: [D-Ill, in House budget debate] Every other national program is being held hostage to the military budget. And, Mr. Chairman, our national security does not depend only upon the number and upon the power of our weapons, it depends as well upon a strong, healthy, well educated, well trained, hard working American people.

MAN ON STREET: It's going to destroy us economically long before any exterior threat from the Soviet Union could possibly destroy us militarily.

NARRATOR: [over video of Japanese automobile factory, other industrial scenes] In the last two decades the United States has lost its competitive edge not just in automobiles, but in steel, electrical components, farm machinery, consumer electronics, machine tools, textile machinery, railroad equipment and precision optics.

ROGER FISHER: [Professor, Harvard Law School] How come the Germans and the Japanese, who instead of spending money on their military establishments, spend it on modernizing their steel plants and their auto plants, how come they're doing so much better than we are? Is this country buying itself into weakness or strength?

WILLIAM W. WIMPINSINGER: Military by and large is the purchase of dead end products--built, shoved into a warehouse with a hope and prayer you never have to use them, and gradually become obsolete. And there's no market for used submarines, used aircraft carriers, or anything like that. But if you put it into an alcohol fuels program, a mass transit program, or any number of other kinds of private sector endeavor, you get a tremendously higher number of jobs per billion dollars.

NARRATOR: In fact, because military spending drains investment in research resources, more jobs are actually lost than are created by military spending.

WILLIAM W. WIMPINSINGER: And as defense bleeds off the life blood of the economy, we are going to see more and more Americans impoverished, more and more Americans reach the threshold of despair, more and more

FOUNDATION FOR

The Arts of Peace

Americans with less and less to defend. And no country can defend itself unless the domestic tranquility is intact.

ROGER FISHER: [voice over array of U.S. weapons] It only took a small boy to say the emperor had no clothes on. Everybody was admiring this great uniform. The people here are admiring the Pentagon uniform. "We'll have a rapid deployment force; we'll have missiles this; we'll have an MX that does that." Those fancy paraphernalia-- And in their hearts everybody knows there is no security--that this hardware cannot protect us against the risk of nuclear war.

ROBERT SCHEER: [Los Angeles Times, author of "With Enough Spades"] I could tell you one little anecdote that is kind of interesting. I interviewed George Schultz and Caspar Weinberger. I interviewed both gentlemen before they entered the Reagan administration during the campaign. I interviewed them at the Bechtel Corporation headquarters during the campaign. And both Caspar Weinberger and George Schultz told me that they did not want to discuss foreign policy or defense issues during our interview because they didn't know anything about the subject.

A matter of months later Caspar Weinberger is head of this incredibly complex organization called the Pentagon. Well, if Caspar Weinberger can jump in with that kind of confidence, then I think the rest of us can jump in. The rest of us can get in on the act and say, "Hey, wait a minute. What's going on?"

MAN ON STREET: You know, every day that we live in this beautiful area, and enjoy this beautiful climate and this beautiful planet, in the back of our mind is the thought that maybe tomorrow it'll all be blasted, you know. And it's just something you can't live with without doing something about. And this is--this is just great to see people... I have two grandsons, for God's sakes. I mean, I want--my time is getting shorter by the minute. [he laughs] But theirs--they should have a--they should inherit this beautiful planet.

[Produced by Bill Jersey. A Quest Production. Copyright, 1983, Foundation for the Arts of Peace]
